



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

when to display wealth was to court disaster. (2) The frequent re-divisions of the village land discourage cultivators from undertaking any permanent improvements. Though mitigated in part by the decree of 1893, referred to above, this is still a serious evil. (3) The increase in population has rendered the allotments in many villages "dwarfish" in size, and prevents the peasantry from aiming at anything beyond eking out a miserable existence. The general conclusions of the author are that though the *Mir* cannot be held responsible for all the shortcomings of the Russian peasantry it is largely to blame for their lack of ambition, of capital, and of acquaintance with modern methods of cultivation. Though favoring socialism as an ultimate goal, he believes with the followers of Karl Marx in the educational value of competitive capitalistic production as a stage in national development. He believes that private property and freedom of contract must be carried to the same lengths in Russia that they have been in the western world before the people will be ready to substitute for the unrestricted despotism to which they now submit, the wished-for social democracy. Finally, he believes that Russian officialdom is already struggling between the horns of a painful dilemma. It is realized, on the one hand, that the *Mir* must go if the revenue of the government is to be increased appreciably, since by its abolition alone can the productiveness of the land of the country be greatly increased. On the other hand, it is perceived with equal clearness that the *Mir* organization alone keeps the peasantry in the mediæval attitude of mind indispensable to the stability of the Czar's power. In the author's opinion, the forces making for the suppression of the *Mir* are too strong to be successfully opposed, but he ventures no prediction as to the time that will elapse before these forces triumph.

Though full of valuable information, and conceived in a scientific spirit, the monograph is badly arranged, bristles with typographical errors—over a hundred being noted by the author himself—and is without an index.

HENRY R. SEAGER.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

---

*The Modern Farmer in His Business Relations.* By EDWARD F. ADAMS. San Francisco: N. J. Stone Co., 1899. 8vo. pp. 662.

SOME men write books for the doctor's degree. Some write for

fame or lucre. Some write because they have something to say. Mr. Adams is in the latter class.

The old farmer's condition is clearly depicted. He was not a business man, but because his own labor supplied most of his wants directly, his business relations were extremely meager. Specialization and division of labor are constantly bringing the farmer to a position where the same business qualities are needed for his success as are required by any other business man. He must be a working man in addition. What these qualities are and how to acquire them, Mr. Adams has learned by practical experience, by close and keen observation, and by thoughtful reflection. He also possesses in a marked degree the ability to make clear to his readers the thought that is in his own mind. One wishes that economists might be gifted with a style as clear, forcible, and convincing.

From reading Mr. Adams' pages one would think that they were written before the present era of prosperity had reached the farmers. Indeed, he states emphatically that the days of agricultural booms and successful speculation in farming lands are numbered. Instead of trying to make a fortune or even pay his debts out of the increase in land values, the farmer must settle down to business and learn

How to produce crops which will sell for more than they have cost. If he cannot in the long run do this, his inevitable destiny is to become the servant of someone who knows how to direct his labor to profitable results. Below this lies the problem as to whether the majority of men possess the business ability requisite to successful farming under modern conditions, and upon the answer to this question depends the future of our rural civilization. If it be decided in the affirmative, the race of independent farmers will continue; if in the negative, farm labor will come to be exploited by able men conducting huge agricultural operations, just as mechanical labor is now exploited by captains of industry.

Economists have usually assumed that agriculture differed so much from manufacturing industries, that the eye of the interested master was of so much importance on the farm, that agricultural operations on a large scale were likely to fail. But as farming becomes more a business and less an art the small farmer is likely to find himself at an increasing disadvantage. He has been able to maintain himself hitherto by selling the fertility of his virgin soil. The test is coming with soil exhaustion. No business man can survive and practice the wasteful methods that are common in American agriculture. In the corn belt

one third of what the farmer produces is commonly not utilized at all. And in selling instead of feeding the other two thirds of his crop, the farmer hauls away nitrogen and other elements of fertility, which, when bought in the shape of fertilizer cost him as much as he receives for the crop sold. This is certainly impairing his capital at a frightful rate. It has been practiced hitherto because when one farm was exhausted another was available farther west. The hope that the newly acquired possessions will furnish new fields to exploit may afford an explanation of the expansion sentiment in the agricultural regions.

In almost every other line of business, men who were ignorant enough to allow waste far less than the average farmer practices have long since been superseded by men who make their profits out of the by-products, or the waste that has been saved. We have viewed with apprehension this process of concentration in other fields, but have felt that on the farms we were assured of a class of independent citizens who have a stake in the country. Populism did much to shake our confidence in the conservatism of the farmer. A few good crops and a season of prosperity among the farmers have apparently allayed the discontent. But unless the farmer changes his business methods, avails himself of the knowledge which our agricultural colleges are discovering for him, and makes the most of his opportunities, he is doomed to the fate that has already overtaken most small manufacturers. Knowledge and hard, persistent work are the means our author points out for the salvation of his independence.

Of course, if the small farmer loses in the struggle and agricultural syndicates take over the production of our food and raw materials, Mr. Adams's book will then have only an historical value. But the loss of the independent farmer means a greater change in our industrial system than many of us have yet contemplated. If this book could be put in the hands of every farmer, carefully studied by him, and its teachings heeded, it would do much to assure the maintenance of his position.

For the many things which Mr. Adams does not attempt to tell the farmer in this book, he tells him the best sources of information, or the best men to rely on. And his discussion of the farmer's relations to his family, his fellows, his competitors, his creditors, the politicians, the bankers, the commission merchants, the speculators, the tradesmen, and the tax-gatherers, is so full of common sense and practical advice that one feels like becoming an agent for the book.

In treating the questions of the day, such as the tariff, export bounties, single tax, currency, trusts, socialism, the referendum, and the labor question, the plan of setting forth clearly the strongest arguments on both sides has been adopted. The chapter on socialism merits more than a passing notice. It is impossible to make an abridgment of the author's discussion that will do it justice, but his novel and fundamental position can be briefly stated.

1. The farmer is the foundation of society, the only class absolutely necessary to its existence. This is undeniably true.

2. No reconstruction of society, socialistic or otherwise, can be undertaken without his approval. The truth of this proposition is not so apparent. If the non-agricultural classes outnumber him, why can he not be coerced? If they be more skillful in political manipulations why can farmers not be divided or outgeneraled, and the change secured without their consent?

3. If there is to be a "uniform, basic standard of life and work," the needs of the farmer, not those of the urban resident, must furnish that standard. His standard is fixed by the forces of nature at a twelve-hour day of moderate work. Plain food and clothing, and a modest dwelling are all he receives for his twelve hours work. He will not submit to the efforts of the trade unionists, the only practical socialists in America, to secure a standard for themselves which compels him to give the product of more than one day's labor for the product of a day of their labor (pp. 125, 427, 432).

Perhaps he will not ultimately, but in many cases he does submit to uneven terms of exchange at present, and probably will continue to do so as long as urban workmen are better organized or more skillful in their bargaining than the farmer. Furnishing the necessities of life gives the farmer no assurance that he will fix the standard of living. So long as the farmers compete on an unorganized basis with other groups more intelligent and better organized, the strength of their position as the only necessary class is likely to be of no avail. When all groups are organized in unions, trusts, and associations, as the author desires, then if a uniform standard is to be fixed, the farmer will be most likely to impose his standard. But, as Mr. Adams has pointed out more than once, all the conditions surrounding the farmer tend to prevent organization, and he is likely, for a long time to come, to lose more in his struggle with other groups through lack of organization than he gains by furnishing the necessities of life. Even among

that most intelligent class of farmers, the California fruit growers, co-operation has been secured with the greatest difficulty and under stress of competition that, without combination, threatened absolute ruin. No writer has given a better account than Mr. Adams of the advantages of co-operation, and no one has given a statement of the practical difficulties in the way of securing co-operation that compares with Mr. Adams's lucid description of the experience of California organizers and co-operators. His chapters on co-operation are well worth the attention of economists. They are not calculated to increase the enthusiasm of the hopeful promoter of altruistic experiments. Although the author, despite an experience that would dishearten, if not sour, most men, is firmly convinced that co-operation will come nearer than any other plan of industrial organization to solving our industrial difficulties, he is a firm believer in the necessity of competition for human beings as they are now constituted, but he wants this to be a competition of groups instead of individuals. His position on this group organization, and the farmer's part in it, can best be given in his own words:

I wish to say here that I wish to see labor equally divided, and comfort distributed according to desert, and, above all things, I favor organization of all classes to deal with all other classes, this being co-operation as opposed to socialism, whose end is the extinction of class. I therefore favor trusts, trade unions, business organization of farmers, banks and associations of banks, mercantile combinations, co-operative stores, co-operative loan associations, consolidation of transportation companies—anything which tends to stop bickering and bring together those of common interest whose representatives may deal and compromise with those of adverse interests, in the light of full information, and under a sense of responsibility, with the pledge of the whole that negotiations shall proceed decently and in order, and with the power of the whole interposed as a last resort. But as a farmer I object to a program involving as its first step an act of injustice to me, and having its ultimate end based on the fallacy that the interests of mankind are, or can become, identical, or that individuals and classes will ever cease to seek their own advantage as opposed to that of others, when as a matter of fact, human interests will always be diverse, and individuals and classes will always seek to accomplish their own ends. No one can deny this to be a just position for the farmer to take or that it has the support of farmers generally. Their numbers are and always will be sufficient to prevent reconstruction of society on irrational grounds, and their strong common sense, unimpaired by daily contact with enthusiasts, will not fail to detect the fallacies which lie at the bottom of socialism.

It would seem difficult to find a logical reason for group organization that would not apply with even more force to society organization. Indeed, the rivalries between individuals, under a competitive organization of industry would seem to be fiercer and harder to reconcile than the rivalries between groups. Stronger pressure on the individuals may render possible organization among them before society organization on a socialistic basis is possible, but it is hard to find justification other than on grounds of expediency, for a half-way position between individualism and socialism. The anarchist and the socialist are the logical men. Mr. Adams admits that socialism furnishes the grander ideal, but he believes that the niggardliness of nature or the laziness and selfishness of man makes the realization of this ideal impossible. One who believes that man's control over nature has reached the point where the product is sufficient to supply the reasonable wants of all does not see the need or the advantage of stopping at a half-way measure like co-operation.

WILLIAM HILL.

---

*Die Sozialdemokratischen Gewerkschaften in Deutschland seit dem Erlasse des Sozialisten Gesetzes.* By DR. PHIL. JOSEF SCHMÖLE. *Zweiter Teil. Einzelne Organisationen. Erste Abteilung. Der Zimmererverband.* Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1898. 8vo. pp. vii + 300.

THE series to which this volume belongs is meant to present somewhat comprehensively the history of a number of representative trade organizations in Germany. The author's point of view in the work is admirable. He announces a purpose of exhibiting the chief motives which have led to the formation of trade unions, the forces which have held them together, and the ideals which they have set before them, as well as the centrifugal forces and the difficulties against which they have had to contend. In the present volume, referring to the carpenters, this purpose has been well realized, though the promised information as to the "ideals" is disappointingly scant — perhaps unavoidably so for want of space. One is inclined also to quarrel with the author's method in presenting his facts as somewhat too generally chronological rather than logical. The volume is chiefly a discussion of efforts by the leaders to control the varying optimism